

REMARKS

Reconsideration and further examination of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested. All objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-2, 4-18, 20-29 and 31-36 are pending. In the Office action mailed July 28, 2004, claims 1-2, 4-18, 20-29 and 31-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious based on U.S. Patent No. 5,517,578 to Altman (“Altman”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,682,439 to Beernink (“Beernink”).

Claim Amendments

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 16 and 27 to correct a recently discovered antecedent basis issue. Specifically, Applicants amended these claims to provide a proper antecedent basis for the term “client application”. Applicants also amended dependent claims 2, 18, 21, 23, 28 and 32 to conform to amended claims 1, 16 and 27. In addition, Applicants amended claims 20 and 24 to better claim their invention. No new matter is being introduced.

Differences Between the Present Invention and the Art of Record

In their previously submitted Remarks, Applicants argued that the art of record fails to teach or suggest a “reference context” received from a client application. The Office Action rejected this argument stating that claim 1 did not recite that the “reference context” is received from a client application. See Office Action, at p. 3. Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 1, as amended, clearly recites, in relevant part:

“whereby the ink information entered at the pen-based input tablet is associated with a client application”, and

“the ink manager stores the ink strokes received prior to the ink phrase termination event in a selected ink phrase data structure and, **in response to receiving from the client application a reference context** affiliated with the unrecognized ink strokes of the ink phrase, associates the reference context with the ink strokes.”

Thus, claim 1 clearly recites that the reference context is received from a client application that is associated with the ink information being entered at the input tablet. Because the art of record fails to teach or suggest a reference context received from a client application and claim 1 clearly recites this feature, claim 1, as amended, is distinguishable over the art of record.

The Office action also rejected Applicants' other argument that, in Figs. 5-7 of Beernink, the ink strokes have already been subject to recognition, whereas claim 1 of the present invention specifically recites that the ink strokes are “un-recognized”. Applicants hereby renew their argument. First, Figs. 5-7 of Beernink present the user, not with any images of ink strokes, but with several type-written words, which correspond to the recognition hypotheses of the ink strokes that were entered by the user. If Beernink had yet to recognize the ink strokes, then it could not possibly present any type-written words to the user. Thus, the fact that Beernink at Figs. 5-7 is able to present the user with several different recognition hypotheses, i.e., type-written words, confirms that the ink strokes have been recognized. The office Action appears to confuse recognized ink strokes with the selection of a final recognition result by the user. Just because the user has yet to select one of the recognition hypotheses presented in Figs. 5-7 of Beernink does not some-

how un-do the fact that recognition has already taken place. Because claim 1 recites that the ink strokes are “un-recognized”, and Figs. 5-7 of Beernink clearly show that the ink strokes have already been recognized, claim 1, as amended, is distinguishable over the art of record for this reason as well.

Independent claims 16 and 27, which have also been amended to correct the above-noted antecedent basis issue, are also allowable for similar reasons.

Claims 2-15, 17-26 and 28-36 depend from allowable base claims, and thus they too are allowable.

Early favorably action is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael R. Reinemann
Reg. No. 38,280
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 Black Falcon Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2414
(617) 951-2500